comments, if you could come forward and we will get as many of you in before Commissioner Copps has to leave.

I'm asking each of the people who are participating in the public comments to -- to keep their comments to just two or three minutes. And I will cut you off. And identify yourselves very briefly by name and affiliation. Thank you. That one? Okay.

MS. PRUITT: I'm Jean Pruitt, and I'm president of the American Film Marketing Association, which represents 150 independent production and distribution companies. I have two points. One of which is that, not withstanding some of the commentary in the first panel, it is not hard to define an independent. In this industry or in any other, an independent from our perspective are -- is a company whose productions are funded outside the major studio system. It is not a production done by the studio down the street. And it is not necessarily or exclusively something edgy, done by a student with a video cam off to the side.

It is, in fact, quite frequently a 65 to 200 million dollar picture who -- which was financed independently, usually by reference to going to a whole series of people and distributors to try to get the money.

I think that as you look at what has taken place in the United States since the Seventh Circuit set aside FINSYN, you could conclude that we have already run the test lab on what

will happen if we go to total deregulation.

The independent industry today, by and large, cannot distribute a film to a theater without a studio deal. You cannot get your picture on video in Blockbuster or Blockbuster's competitor without a studio deal. The independents do not, by and large, produce network TV series because there is no place for them. And today, there is virtually no significant cable network that is acquiring product from outside its own internal workings or the "re-purposing from networks."

Why should the FCC care about that? I think they should care about it for a lot of the reasons that have already been stated. One of which is simply there are a lot of other stories out there that will not get told if we limit the production process to a few studios. But the larger reason relates to two things. One of which is that the independents are in fact the test lab themselves for the entire industry.

This is the way new voices come up the process. This is the way new actors, new directors and new stories come forward. Some of them are fabulous, some of them are not, but without that process you limit the industry to a very narrow spectrum. And that would damage the American public.

I think the other thing that we are seeing increasingly, and it has economic and employment consequences as well as subject matter consequences, is that most independent film

production today is largely dependent on foreign co-productions and subsidies. And over time that means that the stories which are being told are not U.S. stories. They are increasingly shifting to stories of the jurisdiction that has helped finance and make those possible. And that is a complete loss to the U.S. And I would suggest that no other developed country has as much trouble as the U.S. does in indicating it's concern about an independent film and TV production industry.

And I question why we've see the FCC make protective provisions for independent ISPs in the Time Warner-AOL merger but turn a complete blind eye to independent producers. When they are the storytellers and when they create a type of value that is something beyond the pure economic. Thank you.

FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible) step up to the podium?

MS. ORTIZ: I just think it's going to take too long because he literally has to leave in ten minutes.

FEMALE VOICE: Well, I don't think it takes too long to step up two steps (inaudible).

MS. GOLDSTONE: My name is A.W. Goldstone. I'm an attorney and a writer, and I'm also on the steering committee of Interfaith Communities United for Justice and Peace, which is a progressive antiwar organization. I come here to express my grave concern about the impact on our democracy of concentrated ownership of news purveyors and whether monopoly ownership is associated with homogenization of information

provided to the public and how the homogenization impacts the ability of voters to meaningfully exercise their franchise.

In the context of recent events, I'd like to present my empirical experience as a consumer of information. And my experience frankly tells us that we're going absolutely in the wrong direction. Because in the context of the coverage of the justification and prosecution of the Iraq War, there was almost complete homogenization among the six major networks in terms of the information that was presented to the American people. Not only that, but the point-of-view represented was almost completely identified with the Executive branch and with the Bush administration.

Throughout the buildup, the foreign press consistently reported misrepresentations and fabrications by the administration that were under reported or unreported by the big six. Similarly, during the war, the foreign press indicated that the story being told to the American people was not a balanced representation of events, but a carefully constructed justification for the point of view of the Executive branch. As alarming as the -- thank you -- and spin of the information was the administration's and majority leader's characterization of nonconforming news reports as treason. Treason. Looked at from the outside we would have to characterize much of what was presented as news as propaganda.

We must ask ourselves how long this state of affairs can

continue before we become a democracy in name only. And frankly, I think that John Taplin gave it its name, which is totalitarianism.

I want to thank you, Commissioner Copps, for coming here and for trying to publicize the urgency surrounding the proposed repeal of these regulations. And, please, before you leave, if you could tell us what we can do to try and prevent this from happening. Thank you.

MS. PRITCHARD: I'm Rosa Pritchard, private citizen. And I've got a suggestion for a way to stop this corruption. I sent a long e-mail to everybody on the registration list yesterday morning about important information that the national media has been withholding. If you didn't receive it, please pick up one of these slips with the URL link to an article I wrote for Democrats.com about this before the 2002 election. I'll put these slips with the URL of my piece and my e-mail address on the table outside the door.

I contend that already the national media has gotten itself into a worse cover-up trap than the Catholic church. I suggested that the best way to demonstrate this is by explaining the basic facts of a lawsuit against George W. Bush, which have been withheld from the electorate. How many people know that during the 2000 campaign, the national press kept secret the fact that George W. Bush was a defendant in a whistleblower lawsuit brought by the executive director of the

Texas Funeral Services Commission?

She alleged that she was fired before -- because she attempted to enforce state laws allegedly violated by Service Corporation International, the world's largest death care corporation, a major contributor to the Bush family. She alleged in her lawsuit that Governor Bush had lied under oath, obstructed justice, and been guilty of influence peddling. Filed in 1999, the lawsuit was at first reported in a normal way by the local and national media until Bush became the GOP presidential nominee, when it was disappeared. Unreported, it continued to steadily advance through the discovery process, including the taking of depositions that contradicted Bush's sworn affidavit, throughout the campaign and through the first nine months of the Bush presidency.

In stunning contrast to the hyping of the Paula Jones case, the media kept everything about the legal developments in the suit against Bush secret, including its secret settlement in the Fall of 2001 by the office of Bush's co-defendant, then Texas Attorney General John Cornyn, just before he announced his candidacy for the U.S. Senate. The story of Cornyn's involvement was then disappeared throughout his Senate campaign.

I wrote my democrats.com article to get the information on the record and to speculate that the major reason the press withheld a story that might have undermined Bush's promise to restore honor and integrity to the White House was their understanding that his FCC appointees would further deregulate monopolistic media ownership. What's apparently going on here is simply greed on the part of media owners and fear on the part of journalists.

People are naturally wary of anything that smacks of a conspiracy theory, but this dynamic requires no conspiracy. The bottom line is simply that when media ownership is concentrated in the hands of a few, virtually no journalists who want lasting careers will risk reporting information that might threaten the interests of owners controlling major media outlets.

has been filled today with dramatic laments about how bad things already are and how they're likely to get much worse. I'll wrap it up. But we can stop this if we really want to. We can get the attention of the public about this danger by finding a way to tell the public about the Funeralgate lawsuit and other important stories already that the already too concentrating media has been withholding. People would understand that something has gone drastically haywire with the press if they learned that in contrast to the exhaustive reporting of every alleged allegation against Clinton, the media withheld the news of the legal developments in a whistleblower lawsuit brought against Bush by the executive

director of a state agency.

MS. ORTIZ: Yes.

I'm an ordinary citizen and I'm not rich, but I have no doubt whatsoever that the people in this room could find a way to use the information in my democrats.com piece, Media Cover-up is the Key to Cornyn's Senate Race in Texas, to break out the news about the danger of further deregulation by the FCC. Please read my piece. Think this through. Produce an information -- infomercial. Buy ads, tell your friends. Do something effective, fight back now.

commissioner copps: Sandra, can I -- can I make a couple of comments? I -- I find myself as you know -- you know where I find myself right now is in a very awkward position, because I have got to be on an airplane in less than two hours. And I'm already cutting it -- cutting it kind of close, and I have some obligations in Washington tomorrow with this issue and some others that I cannot ignore. So I guess I would ask first of all, is this -- this is going to continue to be taped?

commissioner copps: Okay. So let me make two suggestions. I will obviously be looking at the tape and I hope these comments will continue because I think this is some of the most valuable input that we get in a hearing like this. In addition to that if anybody wants to e-mail me directly before the tape gets there, I'm at mcopps@fcc.gov.

Now, let me just say a number of people have asked me and

I've gotten some notes, you know -- what can we do? We've only got 35 days left. I think the previous speaker just hit on a lot of what we can do is -- and I tried to indicate this in my remarks. We've got to do everything we can to try to make this a grassroots effort. It involves using the Internet. Finding some -- some other spokesmen to speak out who can compel network attention. We have tried to talk and strategize a little bit about this last night at dinner and will continue to do so. But we've got to make sure that we use the momentum that has been created here now to try to make a difference between now and June 2nd, and hopefully we can make a difference.

Hopefully, we can slow things down a little bit.

Hopefully we can get these proposals, whatever they are, that are going to be introduced out in the sunshine of public opinion, before we carve them into -- into stone. And then going forward from that, we need to use this momentum to make sure that we can really spark a grassroots dialogue on the future of media in this country. And I think -- I think we've started down that road.

We've got a long way to go, but we -- I think we've got enough momentum where maybe we can compel that. But, you know, take your thoughts to the talk shows, letters to the editor, your neighbors, your decision makers, your elected officials, wherever you can. It's a critically important four weeks that

we are about to embark on here. We're at perhaps the most critical for our telecommunication issues in many, many years.

And with that I -- I really have to make sincere and abject apologies, but I'm going to have to go. But I do want to hear what everybody here has to say and I do want you to e-mail me. I will watch the tape, and I'm happy to talk to any of these folks anytime.

And I want to thank you again for convening what I think was a very valuable session here. I've picked up new granular information and detailed information, which I will try to share with my colleagues. I picked up a lot of new perspectives, just drinking in the wisdom of people who have been in the industry for so very, very long and really have a feel for it's heart and soul. And that's important to me too. So it's been -- it's been very valuable and instructive for me, and I hope you will continue the dialogue here when I leave. And I hope you will continue the dialogue when you leave this room too with everybody else.

So I want to thank everybody for taking the time and trouble to come out.

MS. SNOW: My name is Nancy Snow. I teach in the
Annenberg School for Communication and also at Cal State
Fullerton in the College of Communications. Washington, D.C.
is into liberating people in other countries' business. We,
the people of the United States, deserve more than our fair

share of liberation from our media oligopolies.

Brian Lowery, media writer of the LA Times, stated last week on a panel that the FCC new rule changes affecting consolidation and ownership of media is, in his words, tremulously underreported. Probably the most underreported news story of our time. In fact, the consolidation story is being reported, but not on the front pages of our newspapers. It is in the business and finance sections of newspapers. Broadcast industry publications, where only those in the know, in the biz, insiders follow this subject.

We have become Walter Lipman's bewildered herd. The public functions like the angry mob at the gates or the proverbial peanut gallery. Occasionally whining that nothing is on to watch, but we know not where to turn for help. So we just keep watching. In fact, I don't believe anyone here has addressed the addictive qualities of watching television, which were pointed out over 20 years ago by Jerry Mander in his book, Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television.

It is truly ironic that as we sit here today discussing

American press ownership, the United States Government is

re-broadcasting Dan Rather, Tom Brokaw and Peter Jennings on

Iraqi TV to show the Iraqi people what a free press looks like

in a democracy. Before we teach others about democracy, we

might try practicing it here at home.

Media power is political power, stated in Ben Bagdikian's

book, The Media Monopoly. No wonder the public is largely left out of this major decision that affects all our lives. We've been asked to sit on the sidelines, to keep shopping, or follow the N-B -- NBA playoffs, while the corporate mega-media and their appointed friends in government cozy up and bring us anything but a democrat --

(End of Side B of Tape 3. Beginning of Side A, Tape 4.)

MS. SNOW: -- applies to official Washington and other corporate sources of news. One 24-hour news cycle requires constant feeding. Which advertising and publicity pre-packaged sources of news are only happy to nourish. In the Federal Government, the largest public relations division is inside the Pentagon, where government public relations specialists provide Monday through Friday feeds to the national media. Embedded reporters didn't just accompany the middle -- the military to the Middle East, but they also sit for pre-arranged briefings from Rumsfeld, Tori Clark and Ari Fleischer.

In the corporate media environment today, the best journalist is increasingly the dutiful journalist. Who understands his or her symbiotic relationship between official channels of information sources and the news story product. Helen Thomas, are you listening?

Long gone are the days of independent journalists like George Seldis, who would have gladly been kicked out of his first Washington press briefing in exchange for the neighborhood goings on back home.

Just last week, a little truth emerged from the fog of war. MSNBC journalist Ashleigh Banfield told a gathering of students at Kansas State University, which is usually where the peanut gallery gathers, that the American people didn't see what happened after mortars landed in Iraq -- only the puffs of smoke. There were horrors completely left out of the war coverage in the United States.

On the other hand, what we did see was advertising, converging media and official sources of news. Generals basically around the clock, who gave us a nonstop flow of images by cable news operators who wrap themselves in the American flag and go after a certain target demographic. It was, she said, "a grand and glorious picture that had a lot of people watching and a lot of advertisers excited about cable TV news." But it wasn't journalism.

I am here as a journalism professor, and I can tell you whether it's in the College of Communications at Cal State

Fullerton or here in the Annenberg School, journalism

concentrations, at least in our college back at Cal State

Fullerton, are all but dead. While advertising and public relations concentrations are thriving. Why? Because students are wise to the fact that the news media business is where the jobs are. Business. Not creating the next Murrow or Cronkite.

They know that broadcasting used to have a clear mandate

for public service that's been lost in the fog of consolidation. Try telling someone that the American people are the real landlords of the broadcast airwaves and that broadcasters are enjoying rent control perks and see what kind of looks you'll get. We all know the truth of what's really going on here. When President Bush assured the Iraqi people that Iraq's oilfields were properly owned by the Iraqi people, I couldn't help but think about that other rhetoric we hear so often that the American public owns the airwaves. We're frankly sick of empty promises.

Everyone in this room needs to carry around the following statement as our organizing principle. The airwaves do not belong to the broadcasters. They do not belong to the advertisers. The owners, by law, are the people of the United States. Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change this dynamic. We will. The public airwaves are an entitlement not a privilege. An inalienable mandate in a free and open society, not something to wax philosophical over or read about in our history books.

If we truly want a free media, and if we truly want the best advertisement of what America's story is to the world, whether it's in Iraq, Afghanistan or anywhere else, then we need to keep this mandate by our sides and show the world what a truly free and liberated people's media looks like. Thank you.

MR. STARR: Hi, my name is Steven Starr. I'm one of the founders of the Los Angeles Independent Media Center. And I recently had the privilege of managing KPFK, the Pacifica station locally. The decisions the commissioners are studying today -- we discussed today -- they'll have a profound affect, as the woman said before me on the way America sees us.

We speak with fervor these days about freedoms -- freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of expression. But every time Commissioner Powell declares the market as his religion, which he's done frequently, one wonders if he recognizes what the rest of the world thinks about his respect for any of the other freedoms we speak off.

When former FCC Chairman Mark Fowler declared that "the perception of broadcasters as community trustees should be replaced by a view of broadcasting as marketplace participants," the FCC apparently decided that the economics of scale trumped democracy, and the efficiencies of capital trumped freedom of speech.

Our First Amendment demands journalists serve the public interest, not the political or the business interests of media owners. The FCC has failed to tell us how relaxing these laws will allow mainstream journalists more freedom to serve the public directly. And one wonders how many television journalists are sleeping well these days. A few, I think, the good ones I know are deeply troubled by the parameters of the

journalism they are permitted to practice.

Case in point: The looting of Iraqi museums struck many as the greatest cultural disaster in modern history, but we can't find the story on television, except to see our Secretary of Defense shrug and say, "Stuff happens." Five thousand years of our cultural history dismissed with a shrug. One wonders what seeds are planted when that's the entire conversation we offer to those watching satellite-casts, all over the world.

I remember a time when a man we all admire said we should all be judged by the content of our character and not the color of our skin. Today we are here as citizens, as parents, as members of a civil society to understand that America as a nation will be judged in this age of media by the character of our content.

You see, the character of our content as it proliferates all over the world tells a story about America, a story that people will either respect or reject. If that story isn't told with diversity, if that story isn't told from a sense of place, a place that allows for a broad spectrum of thought, that enables ideas to be argued with passion and mutual respect, then our American story isn't worth telling to the rest of the world.

Again, it is up to this commission to understand that the character of our content will be defined entirely by the liberties implicit in our ideas. That our children's future

will be insured by the protections under which those ideas are expressed. And that our security in the eyes of the world will only be guaranteed by a global perception that we are here to advance the prospect for democracy before capital, for human diversity before market controls, and for freedom of expression before shareholder demands.

I urge you to consider this carefully. Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: I'm Michael Turner Thomas. I'm a micro-power broadcaster, unlicensed. And I can say openly that the corporate media in this country has been outright hostile to Africans in America. I experience it every day. I walk down the street, people will approach me on a sidewalk, and they will walk out into the street to avoid getting close to me. Because, according to the corporate media, I am a criminal because I'm of obvious African ancestry and I have a penis.

Well, I am none of that, other than being of obvious African ancestry and having a penis.

I am not judged by my intellect, my intelligence, nor the goodness in my heart. I'm making a point of this in particular because of the limited way to combat the image of distortion that is being projected by the lying, corporate media.

One particular case in point is the funeral of Huey

Newton. Channel 2, up in Oakland, broadcast something critical

of Huey Newton just before his funeral. And representatives of

that particular station showed up at his funeral, much to the

dismay of a lot of people to whom Huey Newton is a hero. And I happen to be one of them. The people reacted by beating up the members of the corporate media for that image of distortion. The very next day, that very same television station that presented that twisted view turned around and modified their views on Huey Newton and projected a more positive image of him. And, indeed, the man did well to try to promote the cause for Africans in America.

Now, to say to engage in combat in something like this, it is terrible. It shouldn't have to come that way, but looking at the coup de tat -- I mean the election campaign of 2000, the Philadelphia police beat up protesters for nothing. The Los Angeles Police beat up protesters in this town for nothing at both of the conventions for the major political parties. And, of course, the media said that the police did such a great job in the handling of this. They did neither. And I think that we should have some recourse greater than actual combat to bring some honesty and integrity to the lying, corporate media. Thank you.

MS. GRUMAY: My name is Michelle Grumay and I'm a member of the Screen Actors Guild. But I'm here as an individual.

And I wanted to address the -- Commissioner Copps about this issue. I would venture to say that most Americans are not aware that the airwaves even belong to the public or them. And I would like to ask the commission, if the public interests

standard is being served, then why is the public unaware that they have a right to look at their local station's license renewal applications? Their TV and radio stations.

I just want to just say very briefly that I happened to look at several stations' files recently. During the last -- the end of the last license renewal period. Before it was -- their license -- licenses were going to be renewed. And I was shocked at the way I was treated.

At one station, I was treated like an intruder. I was interrogated, I was asked who I was. Who did I represent? I couldn't just be an individual. I had to represent some organization. At another, they sent in the security guard when I started looking -- after I first ask the person who was in charge in the general manager's office could I look at the file. And he said I was not allowed to look at the file.

Now, this is in deep contrast to the way I was treated many years ago when there was a Fairness Doctrine. When we had more rights. And I just like to say that this is something that's really important. These -- these are public documents. The stations do not go out of their way to let people know that they have a right to do a license challenge. That they can challenge the license renewal of their local stations. They can talk about the discrimination. They can look at the files and see and -- and see where -- their irregularities.

But if the public doesn't even know they have a right to

do this, if they don't even announce it anymore on public service ads that say you have a right to come to your -these -- our station and look at our license renewal file, I think this a very important right and I think it's being misused.

MS. KENNEDY: My name is Mimi Kennedy and I'm an actress. I was on a show called Dharma and Greg. And I really came here as a citizen, but I realized when I showed up, people might have thought I came to bite the hand the feeds me. I really am here not for any organization. KPFK, which is listener sponsored radio, the only radio that I listen to along with some of the NPR stations, alerted me to the fact that this was going and I didn't write down where. So then I had to do half an hour searching on the Internet to ask the right question to find out where this actually was. It wasn't on the USC website and it certainly wasn't on the FCC website.

So this brings to fore the -- whoever controls the facts controls the narrative. And the problem with consolidation is the facts are in fewer hands. We'd like to trust that, but we simply can't. The Founding Fathers didn't, and we need democracy, a multiplicity of voices, a multiplicity of people collecting and interpreting facts.

I remember -- I'm conditioned by the Cold War and how we used to laugh at the idea there were elections in the Soviet Union or that they had news and it was Pravda. And we were

very merry about the fact that you couldn't trust it for real news. I would hate to see America devolve into this, but I never watch television news because a certain part of me feels as if I'm watching some Pravda-like cheerleading and I won't necessarily be getting the facts that I do on listener sponsored radio, which I'm lucky enough to have in Los Angeles.

I really wanted to come here and have the FCC hear how upset I am as a citizen about hate radio. I've just listened to it to educate myself, and I am shocked that the devolution of the airwaves that most Americans listen to has sunk to this. And now I see why our democracy is becoming more difficult because people feel this discourse of ridicule and threat and demonization is proper patriotic discourse.

The FCC should certainly be ashamed of itself that it has let things get so far on AM radio. I don't think further consolidation will solve this problem. Therefore, I would like to support the people who said here, as Marty Kaplan with his Pew research study, we certainly need to not vote on anything June 2nd.

The public isn't here because the public didn't know.

This isn't a public town hall. God bless us, we're providers.

I realize I'm here as a professional actress. Unwittingly,

more appropriately here as that certainly than any member of

the public. There is only one other person that I met here who

came -- I'm sure there are more of you, but in my speaking --

as a member of the public. So, please, FCC -- who is ever watching this -- do not think this was a public town hall. The public doesn't know. The public is not here and that goes back to whoever controls the facts controls the narrative. The facts are not out there that this is happening. The public control of the airwaves is an illusion. I don't want our democracy to become an illusion.

So absolutely hold off this vote and look at what you do before you make our democracy an illusion by having fewer people control the facts. And they don't have a good record with this so far. Thank you.

MR. FRIED: Well, they say don't follow children and animals. Let's add actresses to that. I wish I had gone earlier. Thanks, first of all, for everybody who is still here. I was hoping to speak to a few more people, including an FCC commissioner. But I guess we have to settle for the tape.

My name is Alan Fried of Minneapolis and Santa Monica. I split my time. I worked in the radio industry between 1977 and 2000, both commercial and non-commercial radio. And I have worked in the Internet business related to Internet radio since 2000.

While I'm not involved with radio broadcasting currently,

I continue to believe in its fundamental value as a

communication service, for information and entertainment, and

its unique qualities of immediacy, portability, relatively low